

Fiscal Note 2011 Biennium

Bill #	SB0453		Air quali effects or	ty monitoring for element to bees	s to determine			
Primary Sponsor:	Curtiss, Aubyn		Status: As Introd	luced				
C	ocal Gov Impact	✓ Needs to be include	_	Technical Concerns				
☐ Included in the Executive Budget ☐ Significant Long-Term Impacts ☐ Dedicated Revenue Form Attached								
FISCAL SUMMARY								
		FY 2010 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2011 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2012 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2013 <u>Difference</u>			
Expenditures:								
General Fund		\$165,000	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Revenue:								
General Fund		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Net Impact-Gene	ral Fund Balance:	(\$165,000)	\$0	\$0	\$0			

<u>Description of fiscal impact:</u> The performance of tasks under SB 453 would require contract services pursuant to assumptions listed below.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Assumptions:

Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

- 1. SB 453 establishes a nexus between ambient air and bees, bee hives, and hive atmospheres; and requires monitoring of ambient air in locations in the general vicinity of the apiaries where sampling of bees, hives, and hive atmospheres will occur.
- 2. The Department of Environmental Quality (Department) has access to ambient air quality data from two EPA-owned speciation monitors operated as part of the state monitoring network. These monitors have previously collected data or are currently collecting data in proximity to apiaries. The collection of this data is already occurring and would not entail additional expense.
- 3. The DEQ also has access to data from a network of monitors owned and operated by the U.S. Forest Service known as the Interagency Monitoring Network of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE). These monitors are currently collecting data in proximity to apiaries. Unless the IMPROVE monitoring is discontinued, the collection of this data is already occurring and would not entail additional expense.
- 4. The DEQ would not be required to pursue rulemaking before the Board of Environmental Review, so the department would not incur expense related to rulemaking.

- 5. The department would be required to execute a contract with an expert for the purpose of determining the most effective strategy and design scope for accomplishing a representative sampling of bees, hives, and hive atmospheres.
- 6. Montana is in the forefront of research on this disorder, with unique virus and disease screening available through Dr. Jerry Bromenshenk and his team at The University of Montana (UM), and Dave Wick of BVS, Inc, (Biological Virus Screening). The department would solicit the UM team to perform the anticipated contract work.
- 7. A contract would require deliverables consisting of chemical analysis drawn from the results of data from sampling bees, bee hives, and hive atmospheres for each site identified in the study design. Contract expenses are estimated to be \$165,000, would be funded by the general fund, and would be committed to contract in FY 2010.
- 8. A contractor sampling bees, bee hives, and hive atmospheres would incur expenses relating to the following:
 - Meetings with department personnel;
 - Establishment of a minimum of five study sites to ensure comprehensive canvass and sampling design integrity;
 - Each site contains four apiaries. Each apiary contains three pallets. Each pallet contains four hives. Each hive contains bees, hive components, and a hive atmosphere. Samples will be taken from each hive and maintained separately. Laboratory analysis would composite samples by pallet or hive condition (i.e., health). An extra (4th) pallet of bees at each location will provide replacement colony in case of bee collapse or loss. A 20% redundancy is built in for sampling and quality assurance. Samples are drawn from each site at three different time periods from spring through fall;
 - Laboratory expenses for bee pathogen and pest analysis of each sample;
 - Laboratory expenses for chemical assay of each sample;
 - Qualified personnel to collect samples and maintain recordkeeping, chain of custody, study evaluation; and
 - Travel expenses.

	FY 2010 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2011 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2012 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2013 <u>Difference</u>			
Fiscal Impact:							
Expenditures:							
Operating Expenses	\$165,000	\$0	\$0	\$0			
TOTAL Expenditures	\$165,000	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Funding of Expenditures: General Fund (01) TOTAL Funding of Exp.	\$165,000 \$165,000	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0			
Revenues:							
General Fund (01)	\$0_	\$0_	\$0_	\$0_			
TOTAL Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Funding of Expenditures): General Fund (01) (\$165,000) \$0 \$0 \$0							
` /	` ' '	•	•	·			

Long-Term Impacts:
1. Study conclusions of adverse effects may lead to additional study or regulation of the control of indicted air pollutants.

Sponsor's Initials	Date	Budget Director's Initials	Date